



Local and regional specialization in plant-pollinator networks

Carstensen, Daniel W.; Trøjelsgaard, Kristian; Ollerton, Jeff; Morellato, Leonor Patricia C.

Published in:
Oikos

DOI (link to publication from Publisher):
[10.1111/oik.04436](https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.04436)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Accepted author manuscript, peer reviewed version

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Carstensen, D. W., Trøjelsgaard, K., Ollerton, J., & Morellato, L. P. C. (2018). Local and regional specialization in plant-pollinator networks. *Oikos*, 127(4), 531-537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.04436>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Local and regional specialization in plant-pollinator networks**

2

3 Daniel W. Carstensen^{1,4}, Kristian Trøjelsgaard², Jeff Ollerton³ and Leonor Patricia C. Morellato¹

4

5 ¹ São Paulo State University (UNESP), Inst. of Biosciences, Dept of Botany, Phenology Lab, Rio
6 Claro, São Paulo, Brazil. Email: daniel.carstensen@gmail.com. Orcid id: [orcid.org/0000-0003-](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3697-1688)
7 3697-1688

8 ² Department of Chemistry and Bioscience, Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark

9 ³ Faculty of Arts, Science and Technology, University of Northampton, Avenue Campus, NN2 6JD,
10 U.K.

11 ⁴ Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, Natural History Museum of Denmark,
12 University of Copenhagen, Universitetsparken 15, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark.

13

14

15 **Abstract**

16 Specialization of species is often studied in ecology but its quantification and meaning is disputed.
17 More recently, ecological network analysis has been widely used as a tool to quantify
18 specialization, but here its true meaning is also debated. However, irrespective of the tool used, the
19 geographic scale at which specialization is measured remains central. Consequently, we use data
20 sets of plant-pollinator networks from Brazil and the Canary Islands to explore specialization at
21 local and regional scales. We ask how local specialization of a species is related to its regional
22 specialization, and whether or not species tend to interact with a non-random set of partners in local
23 communities. Local and regional specialization were strongly correlated around the 1:1 line,
24 indicating that species conserve their specialization levels across spatial scales. Furthermore, most
25 plants and pollinators also showed link conservatism repeatedly across local communities, and thus
26 seem to be constrained in their fundamental niche. However, some species are more constrained
27 than others, indicating true specialists. We argue that several geographically separated populations
28 should be evaluated in order to provide a robust evaluation of species specialization.

29

30 Keywords: community, scale, spatial variation, partner fidelity, link conservatism

31 **Introduction**

32 The Earth's biodiversity is shaped by a plethora of interactions between species that may range
33 from being relatively specialized to relatively generalized, and the exact nature of these interactions
34 depend upon a variety of ecological and evolutionary factors. Many of these types of interactions
35 are common and ecologically vital; pollination by animals for example is the norm for an estimated
36 87.5% of the c. 352,000 species of flowering plants (Ollerton et al. 2011). Extensive work based on
37 visitation data between plants and pollinators indicate that such interactions tend to be more
38 generalized than previously thought, even for tropical systems (Ollerton and Cranmer 2002,
39 Schleuning et al. 2012, Waser et al. 1996). However, recent studies, considering visitation
40 frequency and service effectiveness, suggest stronger fidelity between interaction partners and that
41 binary visitation data might overestimate generalization levels (King et al. 2013, Rosas-Guerrero et
42 al. 2014 – though see Ollerton et al. 2015). Furthermore, several studies indicate that species can
43 appear as generalists while actually being composed of specialist populations, or even generalist
44 populations composed of specialist individuals (Araujo et al. 2008, Bolnick et al. 2002, Devictor et
45 al. 2010, Dupont et al. 2011, Fox and Morrow 1981, Tur et al. 2014). Such studies suggest that
46 phylogenetic and geographic scale are highly relevant when studying specialization, and sampling
47 of multiple populations is necessary to reliably determine the niche breath of a species to account
48 for cross-community variation (Carstensen et al. 2014, Fox and Morrow 1981, Ollerton et al. 2007,
49 Ollerton et al. 2009, Poisot et al. 2015, Trøjelsgaard et al. 2015).

50 The fundamental taxonomic niche of a species describes the set of potential interaction
51 partners as determined by functional traits (Junker et al. 2013). Conversely, the realized taxonomic
52 niche is the subset of species within a given community with which the focal species interacts.
53 Thus, while functional traits do not necessarily enable us to predict the occurrence of a given
54 interaction, they do partly define the set of possible interactions (Morales-Castilla et al. 2015) and

55 trait complementarity does seem to consistently govern general interaction patterns within
56 communities (Carstensen et al. 2016). The fundamental and realized niche concepts are related to
57 specialization at the level of species and populations respectively, and the fundamental niche is
58 seldom fully realized in any single local community because of differences in relative abundances,
59 species composition and other biotic and abiotic factors (Burkle et al. 2016, Carstensen et al. 2014,
60 Trøjelsgaard et al. 2015).

61 Here, we explore species specialization across interacting plants and pollinators within two
62 contrasting regions: Brazilian *campo rupestre*, or rupestrian grasslands, and the Canary Islands.
63 Both datasets consist of seven spatially separated community-level plant-pollinator networks,
64 sampled in a standardized way within their regions. Using these data we explore the relationship
65 between local and regional specialization, and investigate whether this relationship differ between
66 these two contrasting study regions, assuming the ecological specialization framework (Armbruster
67 2017). Specifically we ask: 1) Are local and regional measures of specialization correlated? 2) Do
68 species interact locally with a non-random subset of the available species in the community?

69 We expect that the specialization level of a species is conserved across populations, but that
70 the identity of interaction partners might change. If so, species would appear more generalized at
71 the regional level compared to the local level.

72

73 **Methods**

74 *Study sites and field observations*

75 Data were collected in October-December 2012 from seven sites of rupestrian grasslands, or
76 *campo rupestre*, in the National Park of Serra do Cipó, SE Brazil (Carstensen et al. 2014, 2016).

77 *Campo rupestre* is a species-rich vegetation of mostly shrubs and herbs associated with rocky
78 outcrops surrounded by sandy and stony grasslands (Silveira et al. 2016). Sites were 1.4-8.5 km

79 apart within an altitudinal range of 1073-1260 m a.s.l. One site was sampled per day with a weekly
80 rotation among sites. Attempting to observe all flowering plant species in each site, plant
81 individuals were observed in 15 min intervals (totalling 252 hours of observation), recording all
82 visitors touching the reproductive floral parts (for more details see Carstensen et al. 2014). For each
83 15-min interval randomly selected plant individuals were observed, and if individuals of the same
84 species were in close proximity of each other they were often surveyed simultaneously. Flower
85 visitors were collected for taxonomic identifications by experts. For each site, the data were
86 summarized in a quantitative interaction matrix expressing the frequency of interactions between
87 pairs of plants and pollinators. This resulted in seven spatially separated networks with a total of
88 101 plant species and 201 pollinator species.

89 Data were also collected from five islands within the Canarian archipelago (El Hierro, La
90 Gomera, Tenerife (two sites), Gran Canaria and Fuerteventura) and a single site in Western Sahara
91 located at the West African coast close to the Canary Islands (Trøjelsgaard et al. 2013). In total this
92 gave us seven spatially separated pollination networks from habitats characterized as semi-arid and
93 dominated by shrubs. The Canary Island networks were 53-455 km from each other and separated
94 by ocean, except the two sampling sites at Tenerife, which, conversely, were separated by El Pico
95 del Teide (3718 m a.s.l.). All flowering perennial plant species were surveyed for flower visitors in
96 intervals of 15 min (totalling 296 hours of observation) in January-March 2010 through flower-
97 based focal observations in a similar way as for the Brazilian data set (for more details see
98 Trøjelsgaard et al. 2013). Most plant species were observed in 15-min intervals approximately 8
99 times (mean = 7.0, Std. dev. = 1.8). Randomly selected individuals were preferably chosen for each
100 of the individual 15-min surveys, although low abundance of some species precluded this practice.
101 Sometimes multiple individuals of the same species were surveyed simultaneously depending on
102 their spatial aggregations, and also depending on the total number of flowers per individual.

103 Approximately 1300 flower visitors were collected for taxonomic verifications by entomological
104 experts, allowing species identification of many pollinators, while some were grouped as
105 morphospecies. Overall we scored interactions between 39 plant species and 249 pollinator species
106 and, similar to the Brazilian dataset, all seven networks from the Canary Islands were quantitative
107 interaction matrices expressing the frequency of interactions between plants and pollinators.

108

109 *Specialization and interaction richness*

110 For each plant and pollinator species observed in more than one site, we defined a metaweb of
111 species s (Dunne 2006) as the network consisting of all species occurring in the sites in which s
112 occurs, as well as all the interactions between them. In other words, it is the regional network of
113 interactions for species s and its co-occurring species. We quantified specialization using the index
114 d'_s , which describes the deviation of interactions from what would be expected under neutral
115 conditions. Instead of counting the number of interaction partners, d'_s measures the exclusiveness of
116 a species' interactions and is insensitive to variation in observation frequencies across species
117 (Blüthgen et al. 2006). Specialization, d'_s , was calculated using the *dfun* function in the package
118 'Bipartite' in R (Dormann 2011); and for all species we calculated both a regional specialization
119 level using the metaweb of species s ($d'_{s,meta}$) as well as an average local specialization level using
120 the local networks in which species s occurred ($d'_{s,local}$).

121 We tested the correlation between local and regional specialization using the Pearson
122 correlation coefficient. Through simple linear regression, we further tested whether the regional
123 specialization was affected by the number of sites in which a species occurred, or rather, the number
124 of potential interaction partners with which it co-occurred across the region.

125 To quantify if regional interaction richness of a species differed from what could be
126 expected if species interacted randomly with the available set of partners, we first calculated the

127 regional degree for each species, γ_s , which is the total number of different interaction partners
 128 across all sites in which the species was observed (i.e. the degree in the metaweb for species s). We
 129 then compared the empirical γ_s with a null model where the identity of partners in the local
 130 networks was randomized while conserving the local number of interactions for each species. New
 131 interaction partners were drawn with a probability proportional to their abundance (measured as
 132 total number of interactions, i.e. the marginal sums in the quantitative interaction matrix) among all
 133 potential partner species in a local community, and random partners were drawn with replacement
 134 until the empirical number of interactions was reached. In this way, the total number of local
 135 interactions (i.e. the marginal sum) was retained, but the regional degree was allowed to change as
 136 species were allocated new interaction partners among all potential partners at a local site. This
 137 procedure was repeated 1000 times for each species, which allowed us to calculate a mean ($\gamma_{s,random}$)
 138 and standard deviation (SD_{random}) for each species. Subsequently we compared empirical regional
 139 species degrees (γ_s) with the randomized regional degrees ($\gamma_{s,random}$) by using z-scores [$(\gamma_s -$
 140 $\gamma_{s,random})/SD_{random}$]. If the z-score was less than -1.96, or larger than 1.96, the difference between the
 141 empirical and random regional degree was deemed statistically significant. Moreover, negative
 142 values suggest that a species is more constrained in its choice of interaction partners than if partner
 143 identities were determined solely by availability (abundance) (we call this ‘link conservatism’),
 144 while positive values suggest that the species is more opportunistic than expected (we call this ‘link
 145 opportunism’). By incorporating species abundance as a way of selecting partners in the null-model,
 146 the procedure leans towards the neutral perspective which assumes that interactions between species
 147 is largely determined by species abundance (see e.g. Canard et al. 2014, Poisot et al. 2015). It is
 148 important to note that the null-model ignores phenological or morphological constraints (e.g. Olesen
 149 et al. 2011), and therefore may overestimate the availability of potential partners.

Finally, we tested for a correlation between the z-scores (link conservatism) and $d'_{s,meta}$ (the regional specialization, or exclusiveness) in order to examine how the two measurements coincide. While $d'_{s,meta}$ measures the deviation of interactions from neutrality based on the availability of partners in the metaweb, the z-scores measure the deviation of the interactions in the metaweb from a null model where each local network is randomized before aggregating the metaweb. These two measures thus quantify specialization, or conservatism, from slightly different approaches and should be negatively correlated. All analyses were done in R, version 3.2.0 (R Development Core Team 2008).

158

159 **Results**

Regional ($d'_{s,meta}$) and local ($d'_{s,local}$) specialization were significantly and strongly correlated in the Brazilian networks for both plants and pollinators (Pearson correlation, $r = 0.76$ and 0.83 respectively, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 1A) as well as in the Canary Islands networks (Pearson correlation, $r = 0.76$ and 0.89 respectively, $p < 0.001$, Fig. 1B). In Brazil, the number of co-occurring species (i.e. the number of potential interaction partners in the metaweb) had no effect on regional specialization values for plants ($p > 0.7$, $R^2 < 0.01$), but correlated significantly with regional specialization of pollinators, albeit with a very poor fit ($p < 0.05$, $R^2 = 0.05$, indicated by size of data points in Fig. 1A). In the Canary Islands the number of co-occurring species had no effect on regional specialization for neither pollinators nor plants ($p > 0.2$, $R^2 < 0.01$).

The null model analysis showed similar results for the Brazilian and Canary Islands networks (Fig. 2). In both systems, the majority of the plant species showed link conservatism because 81% (Brazil) and 57% (Canary Islands) of the plants had significantly fewer regional interaction partners than expected if partner identity were determined solely by availability (abundance). That is, these species tend to conserve their interaction partners across sites. The majority of the pollinators also

174 showed link conservatism in Brazil but not in the Canary Islands as 58% and 46% of the
175 pollinators, respectively, had significantly fewer regional interaction partners. Finally, the
176 pollinators deviation from randomness (i.e. the z-scores, with negative and positive values being
177 suggestive of link conservatism and opportunism, respectively) correlated significantly and
178 negatively with regional specialization in both Brazil (Pearson correlation, $r = -0.34$, $p < 0.001$) and
179 the Canary Islands (Pearson correlation, $r = -0.30$, $p = 0.009$), while the relationship where non-
180 significant for plants in both Brazil (Pearson correlation, $r = -0.25$, $p = 0.14$) and the Canary Islands
181 (Pearson correlation, $r = 0.16$, $p = 0.50$) (Fig. 3).

182

183 **Discussion**

184 The results from the two regions were surprisingly similar. Local and regional specialization were
185 strongly correlated in both regions. Plants were generally more specialized than pollinators (Fig. 1)
186 despite a general trend of having more interaction partners (Fig. 2). A correlation between local and
187 regional specialization was expected, however, a strong correlation close to 1:1 indicates that local
188 and regional specialization, in terms of d'_s , is largely interchangeable, and that species in plant-
189 pollinator networks are consistent in their specialization level across scales. By aggregating the
190 specialization level across geographically separated sampling sites, the current procedure attempted
191 to capture the differences in interactions that can be found between populations and individuals (see
192 e.g. Araujo et al. 2008, Tur et al. 2014). In the Canary Islands the geographical distance between
193 sites varied from 52 to 456 km, while the distance in Brazil varied between 1.4 and 8.5 km. Yet, the
194 rocky outcrops found in the *campo rupestre*, within which the surveys were done in Brazil, can to
195 some extent be seen as isolated habitat patches within a matrix of grassland, and the actual isolation
196 between the populations is likely larger than the geographical distances dictates. However, we
197 cannot preclude that increasing the geographical extent so that we covered even more distant

198 populations, especially in Brazil, would lead to different results. Nevertheless, it seems encouraging
199 that the relationship between local and regional specialization were almost identical when
200 comparing the Brazilian and Canarian communities, which suggest that this pattern might actually
201 be a general trend. More studies from different communities are needed, however, to explore the
202 generality of this finding.

203 Larger distances and increased isolation between sites could result in local population-
204 specific adaptations within species, and thus translate into a larger inter-island variability in
205 interaction partners, which ultimately would result in higher opportunism at the regional scale
206 (Thompson 2005, Trøjelsgaard et al. 2015). Indeed, this could potentially partly explain why a
207 lower percentage of plants and animals showed link conservatism in the Canary Island compared
208 with the networks in Brazil. In fact, it is important to note that the Brazilian and Canarian
209 communities also differ in a number of other aspects. For example, across the sampling sites the
210 ratio of pollinators:plants were on average 4.4 ± 1.0 (mean \pm SD) in the Canary Islands, and 2.6 ± 0.4
211 in Brazil. A lower diversity of plants in the Canarian communities may hamper the pollinators
212 potential to show a strong fidelity across sites when compared with a null model. However, if
213 partner diversity was the sole explanation, we would expect the Canarian plants to show a stronger
214 fidelity as they have more partners to choose from and, therefore, a larger potential to deviate from
215 the null model. Nonetheless, as mentioned, both Canarian plants and pollinators had a lower
216 percentage of link conservative species compared with the species found in Brazil. Thus, partner
217 diversity (i.e. the pollinators:plants ratio) is likely not the sole explanation. Another important
218 aspect could be species turnover (see also Carstensen et al 2014, Trøjelsgaard et al. 2015). That is,
219 if there is a strong turnover in partners from site to site (or island to island) the potential for link
220 conservatism diminishes. The plant communities were on average more similar across the Canary
221 Islands (average Sorensen similarity across sites \pm SD, Canary Islands = 0.44 ± 0.13 ; Brazil = 0.33

222 ± 0.14), while the pollinator communities on average were more similar in Brazil (average Sorensen
223 similarity across sites \pm SD, Canary Islands = 0.24 ± 0.12 ; Brazil = 0.43 ± 0.06). Thus, while the
224 high turnover of pollinators at the Canary Island might explain why a lower percentage of the plants
225 show significant link conservatism, this does not explain the patterns observed for the pollinators.
226 Finally, the studied communities also differ in e.g. species composition, climate conditions, and
227 other biotic and abiotic aspects, which makes it difficult to isolate a single common mechanism as
228 responsible for the difference in link conservatism between the Canarian and Brazilian
229 communities.

230 Overall, for specialist species the foraging and interaction choices are most likely a
231 consequence of trait complementarities, while generalists could be expected to forage or interact
232 mainly according to relative abundances of potential partners. Link conservatism should therefore
233 be higher for specialist species, as we have confirmed (Fig. 3). Indeed, as we argue below, link
234 conservatism and d'_s should be evaluated together to reliably indicate true specialists.

235 Our results show that most species have significantly fewer regional interactions than
236 expected based on our null model. Thus, at the local scale species are constrained in their
237 fundamental niche, indicating innate restrictions in their interaction partners, likely because of trait
238 complementarity (Olesen et al. 2011, Santamaria and Rodríguez-Girones 2007). Species with the
239 largest negative z-values tend to interact repeatedly with the same species across sites, and they
240 therefore show high link conservatism (see also Trøjelsgaard et al. 2015). This indicates stronger
241 constraints on the fundamental niche. Even within the species that show significant link
242 conservatism (z-score < -1.96) some species show much stronger constraints, indicating true
243 specialists. Interestingly, the level of conservatism seems unrelated to regional interaction richness
244 (γ_s) (Fig. 2). We argue that labeling a species as specialist is not necessarily dependent only upon it
245 having few interaction partners, but that interactions are repeatedly formed with the same subset of

species, and thus showing a strong signal of link conservatism. This might add another dimension to the discussion about species specialization vs. generalization (Ollerton et al. 2007, Rosas-Guerrero et al. 2014, Schleuning et al. 2012, Waser 2006), as the categorization as specialist or generalist might be strongly dependent upon the spatial scale at which species are investigated. For pollinators there was a significant correlation between z-scores and the measurement of regional specialization ($d'_{s,meta}$) in both Brazil and the Canary Island, which further supports the designation of true specialists. It is here important to re-emphasize that our null model was framed around the neutral theory suggesting that biotic interaction to a large extent is governed by species abundance (Canard et al. 2014, Poisot et al. 2015). By ignoring any phenological and morphological constraints we may overestimate the availability of potential partners, and some species may appear more conservative than if such constraints were also taken into account. Importantly, however, large deviation from randomness also occurred among species having many regional interaction partners, where there is little evidence of phenological and morphological constraints, as they interact with a large proportion of the available partners. Therefore, incorporating such constraints would probably have minimal impact for at least some of the species. Still, with good phenological resolution and detailed morphological trait data the impact of these constraints could be explored further. Also, our approach could be further applied to investigate the role of floral traits in defining visitation fidelity, revisiting the discussion on the generalization in pollination system towards the tropics (Ollerton et al. 2009, Rosas-Guerrero et al. 2014, Schleuning et al. 2012), with consequences for plant reproductive success and adaptation to environmental changes.

The interaction richness of a species is ultimately limited by the availability of potential partners at a given site, which, in turn, is determined by functional traits (Ibanez et al. 2016). However, according to our results, it would be sensible to distinguish between niche breadth and specialization, because link conservatism (z-scores) and niche breadth (regional interaction

richness) were not correlated (Fig. 2). In some cases, species with wider niches might repeatedly choose the same partners across populations while species with narrower niches exert a random pattern, indicating specialists and generalists, respectively. Thus, we argue that measures of local and regional specialization, together with a null model approach, can provide a robust evaluation of species specialization by including information on whether the identity of interaction partners change across local populations.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Cedro Company, ICMBio and Reserva Vellozia for permission to work in their protected areas. DWC is grateful to Nathália Miranda and Otto Carstensen for their contributions.

Funding

This work was funded by São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) grants #2011/22635-2 and #2014/01594-4 to DWC, #2010/51307-0 to LPCM and Visiting Research grant #2013/14442-5 to JO, the Danish Council for Independent Research | FNU #109751 to DWC and CNPq research productivity grant to LPCM.

Author contributions

The first and second author contributed equally to this paper.

290 Figure 1. Mean local specialization ($d'_{s,local}$) and regional specialization ($d'_{s,meta}$) are strongly
291 positively correlated in both Brazil and the Canary islands. Plants and pollinators are represented by
292 blue and red points, respectively. The size of the data points indicate the number of co-occurring
293 species (i.e. the number of potential interaction partners in the metaweb). Note that plants are
294 generally more specialized than pollinators.

295

296 Figure 2. Null model analysis on expected regional interaction richness vs. observed regional
297 interaction richness (γ_s). A z-score below -1.96 means that the species has significantly fewer
298 regional interaction partners than expected from random (link conservatism), and colored data
299 points fall below this threshold. Density curves indicate the distribution of points across the spectra.
300 Note that plants generally have more interaction partners (higher interaction richness) than
301 pollinators. Plants and pollinators are represented by blue and red points, respectively.

302

303 Figure 3. Z-scores and regional specialization ($d'_{s,meta}$) show significantly negative correlations for
304 pollinators in both Brazil ($r = -0.34$, $p < 0.001$) and the Canary Islands ($r = -0.30$, $p = 0.009$). These
305 are highlighted with trend lines. For the plant species, however, the relationships were non-
306 significant in both Brazil and the Canary Islands and trend lines have been omitted. Plants and
307 pollinators are represented by blue and red points, respectively.

308

309 **References**

- 310 Armbruster, W. S. (2017), The specialization continuum in pollination systems: diversity of
311 concepts and implications for ecology, evolution and conservation. *Functional Ecology*, 31: 88–
312 100. doi: 10.1111/1365-2435.12783
- 313 Araujo, M. S., et al. 2008. Network analysis reveals contrasting effects of intraspecific competition
314 on individual versus population diets. - *Ecology* 89: 1981-1993.
- 315 Blüthgen, N., et al. 2006. Measuring specialization in species interaction networks. - *BMC ecology*
316 6: 1-12.
- 317 Bolnick, D. I., et al. 2002. Measuring individual-level resource specialization. - *Ecology* 83: 2936-
318 2941.
- 319 Burkle, L. A., et al. 2016. The beta-diversity of species interactions: Untangling the drivers of
320 geographic variation in plant-pollinator diversity and function across scales. - *Am J Bot* 103: 118-
321 128.
- 322 Canard, E.F., Mouquet, N., Mouillot, D., Stanko, M., Miklisova, D. & Gravel, D. (2014) Empirical
323 Evaluation of Neutral Interactions in Host-Parasite Networks. *The American Naturalist*, **183**, 468-
324 479.
- 325 Carstensen, D. W., et al. 2016. Modularity, pollination systems, and interaction turnover in plant-
326 pollinator networks across space. - *Ecology* 97: 1298-1306.
- 327 Carstensen, D. W., et al. 2014. Beta diversity of plant-pollinator networks and the spatial turnover
328 of pairwise interactions. - *PLoS One* 9(11): e112903.
- 329 Devictor, V., et al. 2010. Defining and measuring ecological specialization. - *Journal of Applied*
330 *Ecology* 47: 15-25.
- 331 Dormann, C. F. 2011. How to be a specialist? Quantifying specialisation in pollination networks. -
332 *Network Biology* 1: 1-20.

333 Dunne, J. A. 2006. The network structure of food webs. - In: Pascual, M. and Dunne, J. A. (eds.),
 334 Ecological Networks: Linking structure to dynamics in food webs. Oxford University Press, pp. 27-
 335 86.
 336 Dupont, Y. L., et al. 2011. Scaling down from species to individuals: a flower-visitation network
 337 between individual honeybees and thistle plants. - *Oikos* 120: 170-177.
 338 Fox, L. R. and Morrow, P. A. 1981. Specialization: Species property or local phenomenon. -
 339 *Science* 211: 887-893.
 340 Ibanez, S., et al. 2016. How phylogeny shapes the taxonomic and functional structure of plant-
 341 insect networks. - *Oecologia*.
 342 Junker, R. R., et al. 2013. Specialization on traits as basis for the niche-breadth of flower visitors
 343 and as structuring mechanism of ecological networks. - *Funct. Ecol.* 27: 329-341.
 344 King, C., et al. 2013. Why flower visitation is a poor proxy for pollination: measuring single-visit
 345 pollen deposition, with implications for pollination networks and conservation. - *Methods in*
 346 *Ecology and Evolution* 4: 811-818.
 347 Morales-Castilla, I., et al. 2015. Inferring biotic interactions from proxies. - *Trends Ecol Evol* 30:
 348 347-356.
 349 Olesen, J. M., et al. 2011. Missing and forbidden links in mutualistic networks. - *Proceedings of the*
 350 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 278: 725-732.
 351 Ollerton, J. and Cranmer, L. 2002. Latitudinal trends in plant-pollinator interactions: are tropical
 352 plants more specialised? - *Oikos* 98: 340-350.
 353 Ollerton, J., et al. 2007. Multiple Meanings and Modes: On the Many Ways to Be a Generalist
 354 Flower. - *Taxon* 56: 717-728.
 355 Ollerton, J., et al. 2009. Fly pollination in *Ceropegia* (Apocynaceae: Asclepiadoideae):
 356 biogeographic and phylogenetic perspectives. - *Ann Bot* 103: 1501-1514.

357 Ollerton, J., et al. 2015. Using the literature to test pollination syndromes — some methodological
358 cautions. - *Journal of Pollination Ecology* 16: 119-125.

359 Ollerton, J., et al. 2011. How many flowering plants are pollinated by animals? - *Oikos* 120: 321-
360 326.

361 Poisot, T., et al. 2015. Beyond species: why ecological interaction networks vary through space and
362 time. - *Oikos* 124: 243-251.

363 Rosas-Guerrero, V., et al. 2014. A quantitative review of pollination syndromes: do floral traits
364 predict effective pollinators? - *Ecology Letters* 17: 388-400.

365 Santamaria, L. and Rodríguez-Girones, M. A. 2007. Linkage rules for plant–pollinator networks:
366 Trait complementarity or exploitation barriers? - *Plos Biology* 5: e31.
367 doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0050031.

368 Schleuning, M., et al. 2012. Specialization of mutualistic interaction networks decreases toward
369 tropical latitudes. - *Current biology : CB* 22: 1925-1931.

370 Silveira, F. A. O., et al. 2016. Ecology and evolution of plant diversity in the endangered campo
371 rupestre: a neglected conservation priority. - *Plant and Soil* 403: 129-152.

372 Team, R. D. C. 2008. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
373 Statistical Computing.

374 Thompson, J. N. 2005. The geographic mosaic of coevolution. - University of Chicago Press.

375 Trøjelsgaard, K., Báez, M., Espadaler, X., Nogales, M., Oromí, P., Roche, F.L. & Olesen, J.M.
376 (2013) Island biogeography of mutualistic interaction networks. *Journal of Biogeography*, **40**,
377 2020-2031.

378 Trøjelsgaard, K., et al. 2015. Geographical variation in mutualistic networks: similarity, turnover
379 and partner fidelity. - *Proc Biol Sci* 282.

380 Tur, C., Vigalondo, B., Trøjelsgaard, K., Olesen, J.M. & Traveset, A. (2014) Downscaling pollen–
381 transport networks to the level of individuals. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **83**, 306-317.

382 Waser, N. M. 2006. Specialization and generalization in plant-pollinator interactions: A historical
383 perspective. - In: Waser, N. M. and Ollerton, J. (eds.), *Plant-pollinator interactions: from*
384 *specialization to generalization*. The University of Chicago Press.

385 Waser, N. M., et al. 1996. Generalization in pollination systems, and why it matters. - *Ecology* 77:
386 1043-1060.

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401






Fig 1



405

406 Fig 2

407



408

409 Fig 3

410

411

412

413

414

415